



Applicant also respectfully traverses the Examiner's finding that Takahashi discloses the claimed correcting aberrations since the Examiner has overlooked one important aspect set forth in the claims. More specifically, the present claims recite a system that corrects or influences chromatic aberration.

While the Takahashi reference may discuss some aberrations in the passage cited by the Examiner, what the Examiner has overlooked is that the claims recite a specific type of aberration, namely chromatic aberration. Thus Takahashi discuss some aberrations; however, the from the basic optical concepts and knowledge, the all-mirror system of Takahashi can not correct or influence chromatic aberration. For example, claim 7 recites that that the first optical group provides compensative axial color correction for the second optical group. The other pending claims also make clear that the present invention and the present optic arrangement is directed to correcting or influencing chromatic aberration.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed nature of correcting chromatic aberration is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited reference and since the cited reference fails to disclose the specific aberration that is corrected, it does not provide the necessary level of teaching to warrant and sustain the rejection. Applicant therefore requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims on at least the above grounds that the cited reference fails to disclose the claimed correction of chromatic aberration.

Applicant respectfully submits that the secondary references fails to cure the deficiencies of the primary reference. In particular, the Shafer reference and the Braat reference disclose much different types of systems as explained in the previous amendment and there is no motivation to keep the dioptric group G2 of Shafer and mix the catadioptric group of Shafer with the mirror system of Braat to end up with the objective set forth in either claim 11 or claim 13. With respect to claim 11, there is, for example, no motivation to for a set of features comprising a correction of the chromatic aberration as disclosed by Shafer , an intermediate image between the fourth and fifth mirror as disclosed by Braat and a last mirror with a convex surface as disclosed by Shafer.

With respect to claim 13, there is, for example, no motivation for a set of features comprising a correction of the chromatic aberration as disclosed by Shafer and a third and a fourth mirror located physically between a first and a fourth mirror as disclosed by Braat.

In addition, these secondary references fail to cure the deficiencies of the primary Takahashi reference in that the references do not disclose correction of chromatic aberrations in the manner recited in the present claims.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims since a combination of the cited references fails to yield the claimed invention.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: May 31, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By

Edward J. Ellis

Registration No.: 40,389

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant